

# MASTER FILE

January 21, 2000

DSSD CENSUS 2000 PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONS MEMORANDUM SERIES R-23

MEMORANDUM FOR Dennis Stoudt

Assistant Division Chief, Processing Systems

Decennial Systems and Contracts Management Office

David Whitford

Assistant Division Chief, Statistical Program Management

Decennial Statistical Studies Division

From: Donna Kostanich

Assistant Division Chief, Sampling and Estimation

Decennial Statistical Studies Division

Prepared by: James Farber, Randal ZuWallack, and Thomas Mule

Sample Design Team

Decennial Statistical Studies Division

Subject: Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation Survey: Approval and

Summary of Results of the Reduction Sample

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Sample Design Team of the Decennial Statistical Studies Division (DSSD) approves the Census 2000 Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (A.C.E.) reduction sample for release to the persons who need this information to carry out A.C.E. operations. The reduced sample is contained in the output file described in Section III, which should be archived with controlled access only to those who require the file for further A.C.E. operations. Any questions or concerns regarding A.C.E. operational needs should be directed to Magdalena Ramos of the DSSD at 301-457-4295.

The A.C.E. survey will be used as a quality check for Census 2000. Approximately 300,000 housing units will be interviewed in the A.C.E. An independent list of addresses was developed in a sample of block clusters previously selected under the Integrated Coverage Measurement (ICM) 750,000 housing unit design. Results of the listing sample selection are documented in reference 1. One of the steps needed to attain the A.C.E. sample from the ICM sample is the A.C.E. reduction, in which the listing sample block clusters are subsampled. Two succeeding operations, small block cluster subsampling

and large block cluster subsampling, will also be used to obtain the A.C.E. interview sample.

During the A.C.E. reduction, each block cluster was placed into one of several A.C.E. reduction strata. Stratification for each block cluster was based on its estimated demographic characteristics along with the degree of consistency between the census address list housing unit count and the A.C.E. preliminary independent listing count. The version of the census address list used to conduct the reduction was the most recent version available, the January 2000 Decennial Master Address File (DMAF), which included updates from the United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File for housing units in mailout/mailback areas. A subsample of clusters was selected within each A.C.E. reduction stratum and state.

This memorandum provides summary results of the A.C.E. reduction sample for users to verify the data products they generate using the output file. Any questions or comments regarding the A.C.E. reduction or the sample design in general should be addressed to Deborah Fenstermaker (301-457-4195), James Farber (301-457-4282), or Thomas Mule (301-457-8322) of the DSSD.

### II. RESULTS

For the overall United States, 14,765 block clusters and 827,208 housing units are in the A.C.E. reduction sample, plus 559 clusters and 56,074 housing units in Puerto Rico. Note that both the number of clusters and the number of housing units will decrease during small block cluster subsampling and large block cluster subsampling. The final A.C.E. interview sample will consist of approximately 300,000 housing units. The results of the A.C.E. reduction for the initial sampling strata in each state and the nation are summarized in Table 1 in Attachment 1. The number of block clusters and housing units in the listing sample resulted from the listing sample design presented in reference 2. The number of block clusters and housing units in the reduction sample resulted from the A.C.E. reduction sample design specified in reference 3. Small clusters, American Indian Reservation (AIR) clusters, and Puerto Rico clusters are not eligible for the reduction, and thus all such block clusters in the listing sample were retained in the reduced sample. Note that the housing units given in Table 1 are the preliminary number of housing units listed in the A.C.E. independent listing operation, and include all units designated as Future Construction. These numbers were derived from a clerical tally of housing units from the A.C.E. independent listing books. These preliminary independent listing housing unit counts are also used for the totals in listing sample clusters in Table 1. This accounts for the differences between the results in Table 1 and the listing sample results previously provided in reference 1, which were based on early census address list counts.

The design of the A.C.E. reduction is summarized in Table 2. The Minority reduction stratum consisted of all block clusters with a high proportion of a minority group. The Inconsistent strata included block clusters where the preliminary independent listing housing unit count differed from the census count by more than 25 percent, with Low meaning the listing count was lower than the census and High meaning the listing count was higher. The differential sampling factors indicate the degree to which the Minority, Inconsistent Low, and Inconsistent High reduction strata were differentially sampled relative to the Non-Minority Consistent reduction stratum. For example, a differential sampling factor of two for the Minority reduction stratum means that the probability of selection for a cluster in the Minority stratum was twice that of a cluster in the Consistent stratum. Two initial features of the reduction sample design were equal differential sampling factors for the two Inconsistent reduction strata, and equal factors for Medium and Large clusters assigned to the same reduction stratum. However, Table 2 shows that in many states the differential sampling factors differ between the Inconsistent strata or between Medium and Large clusters in the same stratum. This occurred because, to facilitate A.C.E. variance estimation, the probability of selection in each reduction stratum was computed to yield an integer number of expected clusters in sample to avoid random sample size variation. This caused the observed differential sampling factors to deviate from their initially designed values.

Table 3 provides the weights for Medium and Large block clusters in each A.C.E. reduction stratum and state, along with the weights for Medium stratum jumpers. Medium clusters are those that were estimated to contain between 3 and 79 housing units at the time of listing sample selection, while Large clusters were estimated to have 80 or more housing units. Medium stratum jumpers are clusters that were estimated as Medium for the listing sample selection but have 80 or more housing units according to the preliminary independent listing results. These clusters are now Large and thus will undergo large block cluster subsampling, which will increase their weights. To prevent the final weights for these clusters from becoming excessively large, all Medium stratum jumpers were retained in the reduction. Large block cluster subsampling is also the reason that Large clusters generally have much lower weights than Medium clusters within a reduction stratum, as shown in Table 3. The weights for large clusters will increase after large block cluster subsampling, which is designed to minimize weight variation between Medium and Large clusters within each reduction stratum and state. Also, as in Table 2, the weights for the two Inconsistent strata differ within many states due to the probability of selection computation that produced integer cluster sample sizes.

Table 4 presents summary statistics for the three major Types of Enumeration Area, and Table 5 shows A.C.E. Regional Office (ACERO) totals. Note that the results in both of these tables include small block clusters and AIR block clusters and the housing units in these types of clusters.

### III. OUTPUT FILES

The description and location of the file containing the A.C.E. reduction sample is given in Attachment 2, which is available only to those persons identified below. For questions regarding access to this file, contact Deborah Fenstermaker at 301-457-4195.

An additional output of the A.C.E. reduction is information for the Field Division (FLD) to optimize their planning for housing unit follow-up. Twelve Lotus spreadsheets, one for each ACERO, will be provided on diskettes to Neala Stevens of the FLD. Puerto Rico will be included in the Boston ACERO spreadsheet. These spreadsheets are named RED\_X.WK4, where X is the ACERO abbreviation. Each spreadsheet will contain the following variables in order for each cluster:

- ACERO Abbreviation
- FIPS State Code
- FIPS County Code
- Local Census Office Code
- A.C.E. Cluster Number with Check Digit
- Absolute Difference between the Preliminary Independent Listing Housing Unit Count and the January-updated DMAF Count. (If a cluster is no longer in sample, the count is set to blank on the spreadsheets.)
- A.C.E. Reduction Status
  - 0 =Cluster is no longer in sample
  - 1 = Cluster was retained in sample
  - 2 = Small block cluster whose status will be determined after small block cluster subsampling

Each spreadsheet is sorted by state, county, and A.C.E. cluster number with check digit. The information contained in these spreadsheets is confidential and protected by Title 13 of the U.S. Code. Access to this information is administratively restricted to authorized A.C.E. staff.

## IV. REFERENCES

- 1. DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series R-16, "Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation Survey: Initial Listing Sample Results," June 25, 1999.
- DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series R-3, "Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (ACE) Survey: Block Cluster Sample Specification," March 29, 1999.
- 3. DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series R-, "Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation Survey: Reduction Specification," September 15, 1999 DRAFT.

cc:

With Attachment 2:

Charisse Jones (DSSD)

Courtney Ford
Anne McGaughey

George McLaughlin (DSCMO)

Jerome Garrett (TMO)

John View

Rita Petroni (PRED)

Without Attachment 2:

DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum

Series Distribution List

Statistical Design Team Leaders A.C.E. Implementation Team Sampling and Estimation Staff

Table 1: Block Cluster and Preliminary Independent Listing Housing Unit Totals for Listing Sample and Reduced Sample

Table 2: A.C.E. Reduction Sample Design

Differential Sampling Factors Sample Size1 Medium Large State -----Minn Cons Min² I Lo<sup>3</sup> I Hi4 I Lo I Hi Con 4470 1.75 1.72 1.81 1.00 1.77 1.59 1,59 1.00 Alabama Alaska 1800 5.87 3.00 2.57 1.00 6.53 3.54 3.54 1.00 Arizona 4800 1.77 1.70 1.89 1.00 1.73 1.85 1.85 1.00 2610 1.00 1.80 2.47 2.47 1.99 2.94 2.86 1.00 Ackansas 1.00 2.98 California 33510 2.01 2.98 3.04 2.00 2.96 1.00 Colorado 4080 2.01 2.90 2.82 1.00 1.99 2.96 2.96 1.00 3360 2.03 3.31 3.24 1.00 1.96 2.75 2.64 1.00 Connecticut 1.00 2.89 Delaware 1800 2.96 3.56 3.12 3,11 3.30 1.00 Dist of Columbia 3.37 13.50 1.00 1.79 3.00 4.50 1.00 1800 1.84 15300 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Florida 1.00 1.00 Georgia 7830 2.00 1.98 2.06 1.00 1.99 2.04 2.04 1.00 Hawaii 3750 2.41 4.00 1.00 2.07 2.78 2.78 1.00 Idaho 1800 2.85 3.01 2.86 1.00 6.40 3.20 3.20 1.00 Illinois 12360 1.19 1.19 1.19 1.00 1.12 1.12 1,12 1.00 6060 1.00 1.17 1.00 Indiana 1.69 1.69 1.69 1.17 1.17 1.00 3.38 3.38 Iowa 2940 1.80 2.94 2.99 3.38 1.00 Kansas 2700 1.93 2.89 3.00 1.00 2.20 3.30 2.64 1.00 Kentucky 4050 1.93 2.97 3.08 1.00 2.07 3.11 3.11 1.00 4470 3.05 2.90 1.00 1.83 3.06 2.36 Louisiana 1.86 1.00 Maine 1800 6.50 2.84 2.91 1.00 2.03 2.71 1.00 1.87 Maryland 5280 1.82 2.34 2.41 1.00 2.43 2.53 1.00 Massachusetts 6300 2.33 2.33 2.33 1.00 2.25 2.25 2.25 1.00 Michigan 10080 1.26 1.26 1.26 1.00 1.18 1.18 1.18 1.00 Minnesota 4860 2.11 2.11 2.11 1.00 1.94 1.94 1.94 1.00 Mississippi 2820 2.01 2.93 2.76 1.00 1.88 2.43 2.43 1.00 1.00 Missouri 5580 2.26 2.26 2,26 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.00 3.25 1.00 Montana 1800 3.03 1.00 3.31 2.84 2.65 1.79 2.78 1.00 1.95 2.93 Nebraska 1800 2.32 3.01 2.60 1.00 1.00 1.96 3,06 2.89 Nevada 1800 1.93 2.58 2.49 1.00 New Hampshire 1800 6.91 2.96 3.07 1,00 3.54 2.83 1.00 8340 2.27 2.26 2.22 1.00 2.22 2.15 2.30 1.00 New Jersev 1.00 1.57 New Mexico 1800 1.73 2.25 1.95 1.43 1.67 1.00 New York 18660 1.99 2.97 3.01 1.00 2.00 2.95 3.03 1.00 7740 1.00 1.55 1,55 1.55 North Carolina 1.85 1.89 1.00 1.84 1800 2.58 3.05 1.00 1.81 3.27 2.72 1.00 North Dakota 2.21 1.00 Ohio 11490 1.22 1.22 1.22 1.06 1.06 1.06 1.00 Oklahoma 3420 2.03 3.03 2.89 1.00 2.12 3.11 3,11 1.00 2.92 1.00 1.94 2.70 Oregon 3360 1,89 2.86 2.91 1.00 Pennsylvania 12300 1.70 1.70 1.70 1.00 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.00 1800 1.00 2.76 2.53 Rhode Island 2.88 3.17 2.72 1.00 South Carolina 3930 1.62 1.00 1.65 1.61 3.63 1.00 1.58 1.58 South Dakota 1800 1.79 3,33 2.91 1.00 1.87 2.81 3.37 1.00 Tennessee 5580 2.00 2.83 2.89 1.00 1.99 3,06 3.06 1.00 20280 2.39 1.00 2.39 2.38 Texas 1.87 2,40 1.86 1.00 Utah 2160 1.84 2.91 3.29 1.00 1.64 2.74 2.74 1.00 1800 7.05 3.20 3.00 1.00 2.96 2.54 1.00 Vermont 1.79 6960 1.79 1.79 Virginia 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.00 1.00 Washington 5850 2.29 2,29 2,29 1.00 1.88 1.88 1.88 1.00 West Virginia 1860 1.73 3.02 3,18 1.00 2.16 3.23 3.23 1.00 1.75 1.00 1.59 1.59 1.59 Wisconsin 5370 1.75 1.75 1.00 Wyoming 1800 2.03 3.17 2.98 1.00 9.80 2.45 2.67 1.00 1.00 Puerta Rico 14500 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1,00 1.00

<sup>. =</sup> Not Applicable

<sup>&#</sup>x27;Target state housing unit interview sample size, excluding American Indian Reservation sample

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Clusters with high concentrations of minorities

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Clusters where the Preliminary Independent Listing housing unit count is at least 25 percent lower than the Decennial Master Address File (DMAF) count

<sup>\*</sup>Clusters where the Preliminary Independent Listing count is at least 25 percent higher than the DMAF

<sup>\*</sup>Clusters where the Preliminary Independent Listing count and the DMAF do not differ by more than 25 percent

Table 3: A.C.E. Reduction Block Cluster Weights

State			Medium	1			L.	arge .	
******					••				
	Min'	I Lo²	I Hi³	Con⁴	SJ*	Min	I Lo	I Hi	Con
Alabama	367.42	375.14	356.39	643.85	168.81	61.88	68.75	68.75	109.38
Alaska	56.12	109.80	128,10	329.40	24.40	9.25	17.07	17.07	60.35
Arizona	365.75	380.99	342.89	646.67	142.87	48.24	45.23	45.23	83.60
Arkansas	300.34	203.46	209.27	598.90	87.20	61.17	44.49	44.49	109.92
California	314.21	211.71	207.73	630.83	144.67	53.64	35.94	36.13	107.09
Colorado	325.86	225.95	232.40	655.49	129.11	48.54	32.63	32.63	96.64
Connecticut	301.84	184.88	188.65	611.63	132.06	58.33	41.48	43.21	114.26
Delaware	116.44	97.04	110.62	345.17	29.11	16.97	15.99	18.27	52.79
Dist of Columbia	162.67	88.73	22.18	299.45	22.18	29.41	17.55	11.70	52.65
Florida	491.10	491.10	491.10	491.10	491.10	66.66	66.66	66.66	66.66
Georgia	324.35	328,15	315.84	649.82	287.13	46.95	45.83	45.83	93.57
Hawaii	125.61	75,80		303.20	50.53	14.40	10.71	10.71	29.76
Idaho	131.49	125,23	131,49	376.33	43.83	10.32	20.64	20.64	66.04
Illinois	378.75	378.75	378.75	451.51	378.75	74.92	74.92	74.92	83.79
Indiana	321.03	321,03	321.03	541.07	321.03	83.42	83.42	83.42	97.32
Iowa	295.20	180,40	177.12	529.91	147.60	30,15	30,15	30.15	102.03
Kansas	306.86	204.58	197.00	591.00	136,38	47.52	31.68	39.60	104.55
Kentucky	297.29	193.19	186.53	573.59	139.90	46.81	31.20	31.20	96.90
Louisiana	344.14	210.00	221.06	640.50	110.53	59,30	35.54	45,99	108.59
Maine	76.08	173.91	170.07	494.55	76.08	•	47.64	35.73	96.72
Maryland	351.86	274,16	266,10	641.05	193.53	50.88	39.12	37.57	95.01
Massachusetts	249.46	249.46	249.46	581.07	249,46	50.35	50.35	50.35	113.28
Michigan	379.94	379.94	379.94	477.30	379.94	74.10	74.10	74.10	87.37
Minnesota	241.75	241.75	241.75	509.72	241.75	45.24	45.24	45,24	87.96
Mississippi	328.84	225.49	239.59	660.55	98,65	62.98	48.76	48.76	118,41
Missouri	288.57	288.57	268.57	652.42	288.57	69.36	69.36	69.36	108.99
Montana	180.03	99.02	105.90	321.39	36.01	16.22	18.93	20.28	53.74
Nebraska	232.80	179.08	194.00	539.87	89,54	46.85	35.14	31.24	91.48
Nevada	338.80	254.10	263.51	655.01	56.47	38,63	24.83	26.21	75.87
New Hampshire	65.09	151.89	146.46	450.00	65.09		23.34	29.17	82.59
New Jersey	287.86	290.05	295.22	654.24	248.61	53.18	54.86	51.43	118,20
New Mexico	381.66	293,88	338,41	661.23	53.43	58.44	64.07	54.92	91.53
New York	324.01	217.28	213.80	644.39	203.11	49.35	33.38	32,45	98,46
North Carolina	350.78	352,28	343,47	647,63	305.31	68.13	68.13	68.13	105.53
North Dakota	91.15	78,13	66.11	201.33		16.99	9.44	11,33	30.84
Ohio	381.75	381.75	381.75	465.12	381.75	77.63	77.63	77.63	82.24
Oklahoma	315.93	211.70	222.29	641.46	127.02	51.58	35,17	35.17	109.41
Oregon	347.89	229,38	224.79	656.02	160.56	53.73	38.58	35,82	104.35
Pennsylvania	310.91	310.91	310.91	529.03	310.91	66.91	66.91	66.91	105.29
Rhode Island	122.17	110.87	129.35	351.84	43.12	24.39	26.60		67.25
South Carolina	409.62	409.11	399.76	647.14	147.28	65.49	66.98	29.77	108.10
South Dakota	128.60	69,25	79.14	230.44	39.57	19.47	12.98	10.81	36.50
Tennessee	326.22	231.32	225.85	653.55	195.73	55.04	35.78	35.78	109.38
Texas	347.97	271.29	272.01	650.58	144.69	48.25	37.50	37.73	89.69
Utah	268.30	169.92	150.25	494.44	53.66	52.91	31.74	31.74	86.92
Vermont	35.25	77.55	82.94	248.42	55.00		15.07	17.58	44.57
Virginia	275.31	275.31	275.31	520.44	275.31	42.15	42.15	42.15	75.62
Washington	252.64	252,64	252.64	577,47	210.01	48.59	48.59	48.59	91.36
West Virginia	380.24	217.28	206.42	656.37	108 64	48.78	32.52	32.52	105.19
Wisconsin	285.07	285.07	285.07	499.60	285.07	61.95	61.95	61.95	98.73
Wyoming	96.58	61.81	65.81	195.91	19.32	3.71	14.85	13.61	36.37
Puerto Rico	92,63	92.63	92.63	92.63	92.63	16.56	16.56	16.56	16.56
LAGILTO WICO	32,03	32.03	34.03	94.03	92.DJ	10.50	10.50	10.50	10.50

#### . = Not Applicable

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Clusters with high concentrations of mineraties

Clusters where the Preliminary Independent Listing housing unit count is at least 25 percent lower than the Decennial Master Address File (DMAF) count

Clusters where the Preliminary Independent Listing count is at least 25 percent higher than the DMAF

Clusters where the Preliminary Independent Listing count and the DMAF do not differ by more than 25 percent Clusters initially classified as Medium for listing sample selection that have 80 or more Preliminary Independent List housing units

Table 4: A.C.E. Reduction Summary Statistics by Major Type of Enumeration Area

Type of Enumeration Area¹	Block Clusters	Housing Units <sup>2</sup>	
Block Canvassing	9074	682859	
Address Listing	5271	138539	
List/Enumerate	420	5810	
Total	14765	827208	
Puerto Rico³	559	56074	

These are major types of enumeration area (TEAs) and are collapsed over the detailed TEAs based on the methodology used to compile the census address list. Block Canvassing includes TEA 1 (Mailout/Mailback), TEA 6 (Military), TEA 7 (Urban Update/Leave), and TEA 8 (Urban Update/Enumerate). Address Listing includes TEA 2 (Update/Leave), TEA 5 (Rural Update/Enumerate), and TEA 9 (Mailout/Mailback to Update/Leave Conversion). List/Enumerate includes TEA 3 (List/Enumerate).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Preliminary Independent Listing Housing Units

Puerto Rico was entirely address listed. The Address Listing counts above do not include Puerto Rico.

Table 5: A.C.E. Reduction Summary Statistics by A.C.E. Regional Office

A.C.E. Regional Office	Block Clusters	Housing Units¹
Boston <sup>2</sup>	1649	112321
New York	541	67756
Philadelphia	1061	60963
Detroit	1050	56395
Chicago	1196	49903
Kansas City	1631	51815
Seattle	1088	68237
Charlotte	1510	86649
Atlanta	1301	90628
Dallas	1402	76312
Denver	1969	75324
Los Angeles	926	86979
Total	15324	883282

¹ Preliminary Independent Listing Housing Units ² Includes Puerto Rico block clusters and housing units